

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/559,984 04/26/2000		Jeffrey A. Hubbell	50166/002001	1784	
. 75	90 01/30/2002				
Kristina Bieker-Brady PHD			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Clark & Elbing LLp 176 Federal Street			DI NOLA BARON, LILIANA		
Boston, MA 02110			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1615		

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A . 15			
· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/559,984	HUBBELL ET AL.			
·	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Liliana Di Nola-Baron	1615			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 10 January 2002 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated as a simely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the control	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	Brief must be filed within the pe R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	eriod set forth in f the appeal.			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5.☑ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly			
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	_				
10. Other:		imary Examiner oun 1\$00			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property, which is inherently present in the prior art, does not necessarily make the claims of the instant application patentable (See In re Best). It is not necessary for the prior art to recognize each and every property obtained by the claimed composition, since the claimed composition and the composition disclosed in the prior art are substantially identical. In response to Applicant's argument, that the prior art does not teach a composition including an organic solvent that prevents polymers from gelling, it is noted that Rhee et al. teaches that the polymer is dissolved in organic solvent and the solvent is then evaporated (See e.g., Example 1). When the prior art device is the same as a device described in the specification for carrying out the claimed method, it can be assumed the device will inherently perform the claimed process (See MPEP 2112.02).

Gollamudi S. Kishore, PhD Primary Examiner Group 1500